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A P P E A R A N C E S

Proceedings taken by Machine Stenotype; transcript was
correct?
A. That's right, sir.
Q. So in that respect you're a whole lot like Yahoo! because Yahoo! didn't know anything about the candidate code before they got sued in this case. You understand that, don't you, sir?
A. I don't know one way or the other what they knew.
Q. Now, sir, you talked about some of the testing of Linux that you did, right?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And you did that testing in order to support Bedrock's -- you did that testing to find out whether you could support Bedrock in this case; is that fair?
A. No, sir. I did that to understand the advantages of the patent.
Q. Okay. But you did that after the lawsuit was filed?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And you did that knowing that one day you would have to come down to this courtroom and face this jury and share your results with the jury, right, sir?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And you knew you had to share all the results with the jury, right?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. But you can't do that, can you?
A. I can share all the results that $I$ relied upon, yes, sir.
Q. Well, sir, you didn't keep all the results, did you?
A. I believe I reported on all my testing results, yes, sir.
Q. You didn't keep all your results, did you, sir?
A. I didn't keep the results as $I$ was preparing my tests, yes, sir; but once I carried them out, I kept them.
Q. Okay. You didn't keep the results that you were making while you were preparing your tests, right?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Now, sir, during lunch -- and again, I don't know if you can see these numbers here that I've written. Can you see that, sir?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Now, I read your deposition and I looked at your report, and $I$ think I've got this right. You tested more than just 2.6 .31, right, sir?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. You tested 2.6.26?
A. I believe so, yes, sir.
Q. Do you give me the test results for that?
A. No, sir.
Q. You tested 2.6.28, didn't you?
A. I believe so, yes, sir.
Q. Did you give Yahoo! or me the test results of that?
A. No, sir.
Q. You tested 2.6.34, didn't you?
A. I believe so, sir, yes, sir.
Q. Did you give Yahoo! or our attorneys or my colleagues or me the test results of that?
A. No, sir.
Q. And the only test results you gave us was 2.6.31, right?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. You know, I hadn't noticed this until I wrote this down at lunch, but you tested 2.6.26. You didn't give us the results, right, sir?
A. That's correct.
Q. Yahoo! uses 2.6.27, which you didn't test, right, sir?
A. That's correct.
Q. You tested 2.6.28, and you didn't give us the results, right?
A. That's correct.
Q. Yahoo! uses 2.6.29, but you can didn't test that?
A. That's correct.
Q. Dr. Nemes talked yesterday about a zigzag pattern. I'm kind of just zigzagging going back and forth here.

So the four versions of the code that you tested, you only shared with us the results of one?
A. The results were all the same, so that's what I shared, sir.
Q. Sir, we don't have the backup data to determine whether the results are all the same. We just have to take you on your word, right?
A. No, sir. You could have replicated the tests. I gave all that information.
Q. We could replicate your living room test?
A. Absolutely.
Q. You knew that you were supposed to be sharing the test results with this jury whether they were good or bad or, as the movie used to go, ugly?
A. That's what I did, sir.

MR. STEVENSON: Objection. May I approach, Your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes, you may.

1 of minutes ago that all the test results are the same and that's why he didn't produce it. He didn't say he didn't produce them because of some Court order. He didn't say he didn't produce it --

THE COURT: All right. You can go back and do it on redirect -- or recross.
(Bench conference concluded.)
Q. (By Mr. Morisseau) As I was saying, Dr. Jones, you knew that you were going to have to come down here and share all the test results, whether they were good or bad or $u g l y$, to the members of the jury. You knew that, sir?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. But you don't have them, do you, sir?
A. I'm sorry, couldn't hear you.
Q. You don't have them, do you, sir?
A. I reported the results that are all consistent, yes, sir.
Q. You don't have the test results of 2.6.26, 2.6.28 or 2.6 .34 , right, sir?
A. They are consistent with 2.6.31, and I didn't run all the same tests.
Q. You didn't run all the same tests; is that right, sir?
A. No, sir. What I did was I did preliminary
experiments to find out that they were all the same and then ran my tests on the one that was all the same.
Q. Your preliminary experiments, you ran it on three and then just picked one?
A. I ran it on four and found they were all the same, equivalent, and then reported those results.
Q. You found that they were all the same, but the version you picked was kind of the one in the middle instead of the first one or the last one?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. I want my question to be clear. I'm not asking whether the test results are consistent or not; I'm asking whether you have the results for the test results $2.6 .26,2.6 .28,2.6 .34$ so we can see and so the jury can see?
A. No, sir, I don't.
Q. Now, sir, in your report, $I$ don't know if you mentioned this or not, but $I$ have read your report several times and there is a section in there about a statistical analysis. Do you recall that section of your report?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And as $I$ understand it, when Linux is
delivered to someone like Yahoo! there's a length of a list which is kind of hard-wired -- not hard-wired but
straighten me out. And I want to go through these one at a time.

You did not test for denial of service, did you?
A. That's correct, sir.
Q. You didn't test Yahoo!'s network architecture, did you?
A. I did not, sir.
Q. You didn't try to duplicate Yahoo!'s network architecture, did you?
A. That's correct.
Q. You didn't test the versions of Linux that Yahoo! uses?
A. That's correct.
Q. You didn't keep all your testing data?
A. That's correct.
Q. No one else has confirmed your test results, have they?
A. Again, I found results that agree with mine, but I have not had someone go and verify my exact numbers.
Q. And that's what was my question. No one, no one, not your interpretation of other test results, my question was no one has confirmed your test results; is that right?
A. Again, people have gotten the exact same numbers, but $I$ don't have someone confirming my test results, that's right. That's me.
Q. One last question. No one's confirmed your living room test?
A. That's right.
Q. And you made several mistakes, right, sir?
A. In filling out that data, yes, sir.
Q. Well, you made mistakes on the witness stand this morning when you testified about the wrong version of code, right?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And when you talked about the memory leak, right, sir?
A. That wasn't a mistake, sir.
Q. And if you had to do it all over again, you would do a few things differently, wouldn't you?
A. I would fill out that chart differently, and I would certainly know the version of code, yes, sir. MR. MORISSEAU: Your Honor, I pass the witness.

THE COURT: All right. Redirect.
REDIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. STEVENSON:
Q. Dr. Jones, just a few follow-up questions.

Let me ask you about these code versions, and the version we had was 2.6.9 versus 2.6.18.

Now, I noticed some of the line numbers were off a little bit. Other than that, is there any substantive difference in those two codes?
A. No, sir. All those codes with respect to the candidate and generation code, those codes are the same thing.
Q. And are your opinions any different from 9 versus 18?
A. No, sir. I've examined all of them.
Q. Is the code the same, essentially?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Now, let me ask you a little bit about the Turner tests.

You were asked some questions about Mr. Turner, remember that, the Xs and the checks?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. What was Mr. Turner testing?
A. His results were focused on denial of service tests, sir.
Q. And how many advantages are there for the patented invention?
A. Well, there's denial of service protection advantages as well as efficiency advantages, so two.
Q. And those are separate, right?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Did your 10- to 20 -percent testimony about performance gains depend in any way, shape, or form on denial of service?
A. No, sir.
Q. I mean, let's pretend denial of service never existed, that there was never a hacker born.

Would it matter, then, to your performance testimony?
A. No, sir. I was not trying to simulate or show what would happen with a denial of service attack. I was trying to show the efficiency gains for ordinary or regular peak traffic.
Q. So let's talk about those efficiency gains.

One thing you didn't put on this chart is tested real-world IP addresses and mixes.
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Is that the big difference between you and Dr. -- or Mr. Turner?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And explain to the jury, despite all these, what's the big difference in your tests versus his tests?
A. Yes, sir. Well, in the tests that I ran, I'm

All right. Mr. Cassady, you may proceed.
Q. (By Mr. Cassady) I believe when we left off, Mr. Weinstein, I was asking you if you had done any calculations of what would happen to Yahoo! if they were hit by a denial of service attack today; is that right?
A. Yes, sir, I did.
Q. Okay. Did you perform any calculations as to what would happen to Yahoo! if they were hit by a denial of service attack today?
A. I did.
Q. Okay. And what was that calculation?
A. What I did is I went to financial information that I was furnished from Yahoo! and I -- based on that information $I$ made a calculation of what losses, the revenue losses would be if Yahoo!'s website went down.
Q. Okay. And I'm putting it up right now. Is this the chart with the calculations you're referring to?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Okay. Can you explain to the jury what we're looking at?
A. Yes. I had access to certain Yahoo! financial information that showed its annual revenues. And what I did is converted that to revenue per hour and also revenue per day based on the financial information and

1 then a description of some of that information by a gentleman from Yahoo!, Samuel Wolff.

So what I found is that if its site -Yahoo!'s site were down for just one hour, it would lose approximately $\$ 289,000$ in revenue based on its average hourly revenue. And if you multiply that out to a day, it would be about $\$ 6.9$ million.
Q. So if Yahoo! is hit by a denial of service attack and they're down for a day, you're saying it would be $\$ 6.9$ million just in the revenue that they would lose?
A. Correct.
Q. That doesn't take into account the long-term effects of customers having problems with Yahoo!, right?
A. Right. And we know that there is an impact. If customers are frustrated because they can't get to a site, then on average over time they go to that site less often.
Q. Okay. And if it happened more than one day in a given year or over the time period that this patent has been used by Yahoo!, are we talking about multiplying times every day that they get hit like that? A. Correct.
Q. I think we've finished talking about factors 7, 8, and 9; is that right?

